



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Büchler's article is a thoroughgoing discussion. The author differs from Bloch (*Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*) and Nussbaum (*Observationes in Flavii Josephi Antiquitatum libros 12:3—13:14*), who came to the conclusion that Josephus had drawn these particulars from Polybius and Posidonius, and also from Destimon (*Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*), who held that Josephus, although acquainted with the works of these historians, had not made any direct use of them, but had found them blended already with Jewish sources, to which he added only a few abstracts, for the most part without value, from Jewish legendary works; he also differs from Gutschmid, Carl Müller, and others, who thought Josephus had read Berosus for himself. Büchler reaches his results by a detailed examination of internal evidence, no item of which is conclusive, but the sum of which makes the construction of Büchler probable. It awakens a somewhat unpleasant feeling to be told that "the very formulas used" by Josephus "in referring to a history of Syria are Nicholas' property," for one is surprised that any historian should copy cross-references which he knew pointed to nothing in his own writings. It is a slight shock, also, to learn that Josephus copied a list of authorities from Nicholas "to impress his pagan readers," some of whom might be supposed to know more about Manetho, Berosus, Hesiod, and others than they would find borrowed by Josephus, and see his second-hand show of learning. Still Büchler makes out a pretty good case for the large use of Nicholas by Josephus, and makes us the more regret the loss of the Damascus scholar's great work, "which contained the history of all peoples" in 142 books. What would we not give for a history of his own times by this friend and counselor of Herod the Great!

HUGH M. SCOTT.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

ZUR LEHRE VON DER PERSON CHRISTI. Von dem selig. PROF. DR. HERM. SCHMIDT; *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, VII. Jahrgang, 2. Heft, 1896, pp. 972—1005.

1. *The religious postulates in the doctrine of Christ.*—The doctrine of the person of Christ cannot be constructed out of our experience. The historical Christ can be known only from history itself, and every attempt to set forth his real nature must accord with the authentic witness of his life. A satisfactory Christology must grasp a correct idea of the kingdom of God, note its essential correlation with the person of Christ, and show how redemption must from the beginning have been taken up into the divine purpose of creation, and how, accordingly, creation is as truly mediated through Christ as is redemption. Moreover, a Christology which conserves the fundamental postulates of the common faith must be able to explain the value of Christ's person, suffering and death for the forgiveness of sin, to make his exaltation to the right hand of God intelligible to us, to point out the absolute authority of revelation which this exaltation furnishes, and

finally, to confirm the Christian's blessed hope and assure him of membership in the kingdom of God.

2. *The unity of the person of Christ.*—It is of the first importance in Christology to explain the historical appearance of Jesus Christ so as to put forth no proposition which is inexplicably at variance with historical reality. The doctrine of two natures is prejudicial. An assential property of the human nature and the human spirit is personality. The historical representation of our Lord is that of a unity which altogether excludes the idea of an artificial distinction of sides in his personality, so as to say, "Here the human nature speaks, here the divine." Rather may we say that his person is divine-human, and so also is his nature, for person is nothing else than the self-positing of one's own proper essence and nature. We do not speak of the sensuous and spiritual sides of man's nature as two natures in man, but as one human nature in which the sensuous and the spiritual are so included and combined as to be truly another nature. So we affirm of Christ a unitized divine-human nature, in which the human and divine are essentially modified. Our terminology thus guards against the monophysite heresy by affirming, not two complete natures in one Christ, but one new nature constituted out of elements essential to human nature and also of the fullness of God.

3. *The relation of the God-man to the Logos.*—The Logos is the self-manifestation of God as it is necessary for the process of the inner life of God. He is the mediator of all revelation. The creature itself would not exhibit the content of the life of God if that which is most central in his own Ego found no creaturely representation. The Son, the only begotten, is the specific and peculiar exhibition, in human form, of this central content of the life of God; he is to be conceived as including the Logos in his separate and distinctive existence. As personal subject, distinguished from God, Jesus is not the Logos but the Son. Therefore the expression Logos has no place in the sayings of our Lord, but whenever he speaks of his preëxistent form he calls himself the Son. In the Pauline Christology also the Son is conceived as the subject of the preëxistence (Gal. 4:4; Rom. 8:3; comp. 1 Cor. 15:47). There is thus a duality of the Logos given. So far as he is the self-manifestation of God for his own consciousness and life he can have no separate existence. As little as the image which I form within the mind ceases to exist in my consciousness while I bring it forth into objectivity, so little does the Logos cease to exist within the Godhead while he is manifested in outer form. The Logos without the flesh is

no personality in the human sense, but the human side to Christ also has no reality except in connection with the Logos. The Son is not identical with the divine Logos so far as he has creaturehood and distinctive being; but the divine Logos is also not a distinct person in the human sense as we use that term of the Son.

4. *The self-renunciation of the Son.*—There lies in the idea of the self-manifestation of God a defining and limiting of the content of divine life, and a concrete divine human life is not thinkable without a *kenosis*, *i. e.*, without a provisional resignation of divine glory and the form of God. But the subject of this *kenosis* is not the Logos but the Son of God. In the only passage where the word *kenosis* occurs the concrete Jesus Christ is named as subject. We are justified therefore in so combining the doctrine of the Son with the Johannean doctrine of the Logos as to understand the Son as the God-man, that is, the Logos entered into a human form of existence and having first thereby become an Ego distinct from the Father and existing for himself. And so the name Logos designates only the hypostasis in the inner life of God, which for the sake of definite manifestation in creaturely existence is called the Son of God in power, and may have being for itself distinct from the Father. This Son, that is, the God-man as such, had no actual existence previous to his entrance into the personal experience of humanity, but the Logos by virtue of his indwelling determination to assume human existence in the Christ, and before the actual realization of such existence, supplies the essential element of preëxistence. So far as the concrete God-man, Jesus Christ, knew himself in his unity with the Logos, he would also be conscious of his preëxistence as a veritable reality. The divine-human glory was also united with the God-man with the entering of the Logos into him; but in his humbling himself, our Lord accepted during his whole earthly life a condition of existence that was actually lacking in his glory. The *kenosis* is continuously realized in the *ταπείνωσις*.

5. *The state of humiliation.*—The renunciation of the God-man consists in his putting himself in the condition of human experience—popularly but quite suitably expressed as a coming down from heaven upon the earth. He thus becomes Son of Man, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and subject to the sufferings and obstacles of human life. He is involved in that same condition of vanity (*ματαιότης*) unto which the whole creation is subjected. He laid aside the divine attributes of omniscience and omnipotence so as to be spoken of as learning (Luke 2:52), asking questions (Mark 6:38), and even acknowledging lack

of knowledge (Mark 13:32). The circle of his Father's activity surpasses his own. Even in the ethical sphere he is so circumscribed by his connection with sinful flesh that in the passiveness which this flesh presents before the world there lie inducements to a selfish using of the world. Hence the power of the temptations of our Lord. Nevertheless, there was given him the consciousness of ability by a simple act of will to withdraw himself from these conditions, and make good his claim to a state in keeping with his identity with the Logos (Matt. 26:53, 54; John 10:18).

6. *The Son of God in the renunciation.*—The *kenosis* cannot be thought of as a renunciation of glory which would leave only a potential existence of the divine humanity, and reduce the historical God-man to the level of common human nature. Such a view would lead directly to Ebionitism. The *kenosis* proceeds only so far as the connection with actual human experience necessarily demands. The self-consciousness of Christ includes his own immediate consciousness of God, and he has within himself an intuitive knowledge of the nature of God (Matt. 11:27; John 1:18). He is the witness of heavenly things (John 3:13). In his mental operations he was absolutely without error. He knew what was in man, and saw through the moral and religious significance of events with perfect clearness. In like manner he outlined, in his prophecies and parables, the future development of the kingdom of God. He is the manifested wisdom of God, and his words and works have no other motive than the will of the Father (John 14:10). He is at once the revelation and witness of the love of God. He was conscious of ability to use at will the power, lying in his identity with the Logos, of availing himself of divine omnipotence and omniscience. It was his glory to manifest this power in miracles, not arbitrarily, but in perfect harmony with the will of the Father. If his works are ascribed to the power of the Spirit (Matt. 12:28), it is because his life with the Father is mediated through the Spirit, and his corporeal life is also conditioned by the same Spirit. So far as this divine life is mediated in the Son through the Logos, he is also during his actual human existence the Lord of the Spirit (John 20:22; 2 Cor. 3:17).

7. *The divine humanity in its consummation.*—The resurrection was the crisis at which the actual humanity of the Son of God became exalted to a state of completeness commensurate with his own true nature. It was impossible for the Sinless One to be held permanently under the power of death. As the human manifestation was a product

of the Spirit, so is the risen body the adequate exhibition and organ of this Spirit. Paul well calls it a spiritual body. It is the Spirit of the Logos already present in this humanity, and therefore the resurrection is not only the work of God on the creaturely life which belongs to the God-man, but also the work of the God-man himself through whom the divine life-process is effected. In the nature of the spiritual body lies, further, the indissolubility of the life. In the heavens, as the world of completed revelation of God, this life attains its supernatural consummation, and so the ascension has from the first been seen to be the self-evident consequence of the resurrection. In his exalted state, at the right hand of God, he is the guarantee for his church that, having begun the kingdom of God, and gathered his people for this purpose, he will also as the personal head lead them on to the goal. The God-man is now, as to his human side, taken up into the process of the heavenly life, and yet he never bears in his state of exaltation a creaturely side apart from the sphere of the inner life of Deity. In that exaltation the Lord exists in the same condition of glory which he had before, namely, a glory in keeping with the human nature united with the Logos to which he was from eternity determined.

An able and vigorous effort, from the standpoint of Lutheran orthodoxy, to restate and defend the doctrine of the person of Christ. The author affirms some propositions which in the nature of things cannot be proven, although it may be said that it is equally impossible to disprove them. The distinction between the Son and the Logos, and the idea that the subject of the *kenosis* is not the Logos but the Son, who is possessed of a divine-human consciousness of preëxistence although not actually preëxistent, is a somewhat novel dogma, but well worthy of consideration.

MILTON S. TERRY.

THE MISSION OF JUDAISM. By OSWALD J. SIMON; with opinions of twenty-one prominent writers, Jews and Christians, and a reply by Simon; *Jewish Quarterly Review*, January and April 1897, pp. 177-223; 403-28.

UNITARIANISM AND JUDAISM IN THEIR RELATIONS TO EACH OTHER. By C. G. MONTEFIORE; *ibid.*, 240-54.

OSWALD J. SIMON, a scholarly English Jew, contributed an article to the *Fortnightly Review* for October 1896 on "The Mission of Judaism" which attracted wide attention. In this article he argued that the time has come when progressive Judaism, with its high theism